



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/100,799	06/19/1998	HIROAKI KUBO	05058/71301	8949

24367 7590 06/04/2004

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 NORTH HARWOOD  
SUITE 3400  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

VILLECCO, JOHN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/100,799	KUBO, HIROAKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John M. Villecco	2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 16-38 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 10-15 and 39-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 1998 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 30, 2004 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10 and 39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 10 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahmoodi (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,601).**

5. Regarding ***claim 10***, Mahmoodi discloses a system for adaptive interpolation of image data. More specifically, Mahmoodi discloses an image capturing device (col. 6, lines 35-43), a laser printer (26), which is interpreted to be the recorder, a display (24), an interpolation processor (20), and an output media selector (16) and interpolation kernel lookup table memory (18) for changing an interpolation process by the interpolation processor depending on the selected output media. The interpolation processor (20) selects a first interpolation process to apply to the pixel data when it is to be displayed and a second interpolation process to apply to the pixel data when it is to be recorded by the laser printer (col. 6, line 51 to column 7, line 42). The interpolation processor interpolates unknown pixels from the pixels of the image data.

6. ***Claim 39*** is considered substantively equivalent to claim 10. Please see the discussion of claim 10 above.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 11 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahmoodi (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,601) in view of Lapidous (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,379).**

9. Regarding ***claim 11***, Mahmoodi fails to specifically disclose that the interpolation for displaying is performed faster than for the recording. However, Lapidous discloses that it is well known in the art to perform interpolation processing for a displayed image as fast as possible.

More specifically, Mahmoodi discloses that a more complicated interpolation requires more processing time which may cause the display to lose frames and the present an amateurish appearing output (col. 7, lines 33-38). Also, see column 10, lines 9-21. Although, not specifically disclosed, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to allow a recording of an image to be interpolated at a slower rate since one would like to record the highest quality image. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to display the image at a faster speed than recording so that a higher quality image can be recorded.

10. Claim 40 is considered substantively equivalent to claim 11. Please see the discussion of claim 11 above.

11. Claims 12-14 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahmoodi (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,263) in view of Lapidous (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,379) and further in view of Haruki (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,949).

12. Regarding *claim 12*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 10, Mahmoodi discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Mahmoodi fails to specifically disclose a gamma correction section for correction a gradation characteristic between recording and displaying. Haruki, on the other hand, discloses that different gamma corrections are carried out for images that are to be displayed on an LCD (36) than image signals that are not. The second gamma correction circuit (24) outputs a different gamma correction for an image to be displayed on an LCD while the first gamma corrected image is sent to the flash memory (28). The ability to apply various gamma corrections to an image depending upon where the image is

to be sent allows for a better image on the display device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a gamma correction characteristic depending upon whether the image is to be recorded or displayed.

13. As for *claim 13*, Haruki discloses that a different gradation characteristic is given to an image signal that is to be sent to an LCD (36) than to an image signal that is to be sent to the flash memory (28).

14. Regarding *claim 14*, Haruki discloses an LCD (36) on the camera for displaying the image.

15. *Claim 41* is considered a method claim corresponding to claim 12. Please see the discussion of claim 12 above.

16. Claims 15, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahmoodi (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,263) in view of Hayashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,427).

17. Regarding *claim 15*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 10, Mahmoodi discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Mahmoodi fails to explicitly state that interpolation is performed for each of the colors of the image data. Hayashi, on the other hand, discloses an interpolation portion corresponding to each color in the image. Hayashi includes multipliers 213, 214, 216, 382, 384, and 386 for interpolating each of the red, blue and green components of the image. Clearly, this is a well known way of performing interpolation in an image sensor. By performing this type of interpolation, image data for each of the colors can be found for each of the locations, thereby forming a higher resolution color image. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to interpolate for each of the colors of the image data.

18. As for *claims 42 and 43*, Mahmoodi fails to disclose that the device interpolates color image data generated using a Bayer array. Hayashi, however, discloses the ability to interpolate color image data using a Bayer array (col. 12, line 34). It is well known in the art that color images are more visually pleasing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate a color image using a Bayer array so that a more visually appealing image is formed.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

19. Claims 16-38 are allowed.

20. Regarding *claim 16*, the primary reason for indication of allowable subject matter is that the prior art does not teach nor reasonably suggest an imaging device that corrects for both a frequency characteristic and a gradation characteristic according to the image recording mode.

21. As for *claim 33 and 37*, the primary reason for indication of allowable subject matter is that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest executing an interpolation process based on a selected compression rate.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (For either formal or informal communications intended for entry. For informal or draft communications, please label "**PROPOSED**" or "**DRAFT**")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Villecco whose telephone number is (703) 305-1460. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
John M. Villecco  
May 27, 2004

  
WENDY R. GARBER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600